

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 06018 300422Z

67

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-03 INR-05 L-01 ACDA-05

NSAE-00 PA-01 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 EB-04 SS-15 NSC-05 /063 W

----- 032115

R 291910Z OCT 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 8475

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO ALL NATO CAPTIALS 4572

USCINCEUR

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSAACLANT

CINCLANT

CINCUSNAVEUR

CINCUSAFAE

CONFIDENTIAL USNATO 6018

CORRECTED COPY -- PARA MISNUMBERED --

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: MPOL, NATO

SUBJECT: DRC MEETING OCTOBER 28; KEY ELEMENTS OF MINISTERIAL  
GUIDANCE - PRIORITIES

REF: A. USNATO 5714

B. USNATO 4527

C. USNATO 5938

SUMMARY: AT OCTOBER 28 MEETING, DRC HELD INITIAL DISCUSSION OF  
PRIORITIES AS A KEY ELEMENT OF MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE. UK, FRG  
NORWEGIAN, SACEUR, SAACLANT, AND MILITARY COMMITTEE REPS FAVORED  
VERY GENERAL PRIORITIES GUIDANCE, ALONG THE LINES OF THE IS DRAFT.  
US, NETHERLANDS AND TURKISH REPS CALLED FOR MORE SPECIFIC STATEMENT  
OF PRIORITIES IN MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE. US REP RECOMMENDED PRIORITIES  
GUIDANCE CALLING FOR MAINTENANCE OF PRESENT FORCE LEVELS, FORCE IM-  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 06018 300422Z

PROVEMENTS EMPHASIZING BASIC ISSUES STUDIES, AND MEASURES FOR  
MUTUAL COOPERATION AND INCREASED READINESS. DRC WILL RETURN TO  
PRIORITIES FOLLOWING COMPLETION OF DISCUSSION OF OTHER KEY ELEMENTS.  
NEXT DRC KEY ELEMENTS DISCUSSION OCTOBER 30 WILL COVER FORCE

CHARACTERISTICS AND CONTINUE DISCUSSION OF RESOURCES. END SUMMARY.

1. CHAIRMAN (HUMPHREYS) APOLOGIZED FOR SCHEDULING QUESTION OR PRIORITIES SO EARLY IN KEY ELEMENTS DISCUSSIONS, SINCE IT SO OBVIOUSLY DEPENDS ON RESOLUTION OF OTHER ISSUES. UK REP (MACDONALD), FRG REP (CAPT WELZLN AND NORWAY REP KLEINE) AGREED WITH PARAGRAPHS 41 AND 42 OF IS DRAFT, FAVORING VERY GENERAL MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE ON PRIORITIES BUILT AROUND FORCES WHICH ENHANCE DETERRENCE AND THOSE READILY AVAILABLE WITHIN WARNING TIME. TURKEY REP (TOPUR) AGREED, BUT STRESSED NEED FOR SOME SUCH REFERENCE AS AD-70 STUDIES TO GIVE SCOPE TO PRIORITIES PLANNING. NETHERLANDS REP (CARSTEN) DISAGREED WITH THE IS DRAFT. STRESSING THAT HE WAS SPEAKING WITHOUT INSTRUCTIONS, HE CALLED FOR MORE SPECIFIC STATEMENT OF PRIORITIES AT MINISTERIAL LEVEL.

2. SHAPE REP (BGEN MILLER) FOLLOWED BY SACLANT REP (CAPT CAYO) AND MIL COMMITTEE REP (BGEN TOMMASINI) FAVORED GENERAL TREATMENT OF PRIORITIES, BUT RECOMMENDED RETURN TO 1973 MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE LANGUAGE. MILLER PROPOSED GIVING PRIORITY TO FORCES THAT CAN BE USED IN QUOTE THE INITIAL PERIOD OF HOSTILITIES END QUOTE RATHER THAN THE FIRST FEW DAYS. HE ALSO ARGUED THAT IS DRAFT PARAGRAPHS 41 AND 42 APPARENTLY LIMITED PRIORITY TO FORCES THAT COULD BE IN PLACE IN EUROPE IN THE FIRST FEW DAYS OF A CONFLICT.

3. US REP (BGEN BOWMAN) REFERRING TO IS DRAFT STATED THAT "CONTRIBUTION TO DETERRENCE" IS TOO BROAD A MEASURE OF PRIORITIES AND THAT DIFFERENCES IN PRIORITIES COULD RESULT FROM DIFFERING INTERPRETATIONS OF WARNING TIME, IF IS DRAFT WERE TO BECOME MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE ON THIS SUBJECT. HE SUGGESTED THAT PRIORITIES GUIDANCE SHOULD INCLUDE NOT ONLY EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT AND MODERNIZATION BUT ALSO MUTUAL COOPERATION AND READINESS. REMINDING MEMBERS OF THE INHERENT IMPORTANCE US ATTACHES TO EACH LEG OF THE NATO TRIAD, HE STATED THAT CONVENTIONAL FORCES NEED THE MOST WORK AND SHOULD THEREFORE GET HIGHER PRIORITY THAN THE OTHERS. HE SAID  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 06018 300422Z

MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE SHOULD GIVE PRIORITY TO HOLDING THE LINE ON FORCE LEVELS WHILE WORKING ON IMPROVEMENTS, AND SHOULD INCREASE PRIORITY ON READINESS OF RESERVE FORCES. REGARDING EQUIPMENT, HE SUGGESTED THAT 1975 GUIDANCE FLAG THE SIX BASIC ISSUES AS TOP PRIORITY, WITH ANTI-TANK IMPROVEMENTS AS FIRST AMONG EQUALS.

4. UK REP (MACDONALD) SUMMARIZED WHAT HE SEES AS TWO DEVELOPING VIEWPOINTS ON PRIORITIES. THE IS VIEW FAVORS VERY GENERAL PRIORITIES GUIDANCE, DELIBERATELY AVOIDING MENTION OF AD-70 OR BASIC ISSUES, TO LET NMA'S QUOTE THINK IT THROUGH THEMSELVES END QUOTE. THE US VIEW FAVORS MORE SPECIFIC PRIORITIES STATEMENTS. UK FINDS IS DRAFT LANGUAGE ACCINCT AND SATISFACTORY.

SHAPE REP AGREED THAT IT IS SUCCINCT, BUT NOT ENTIRELY SATISFACTORY SINCE IT RESTRICTS PRIORITY TO FORCES AVAILABLE IN THE FIRST FEW DAYS. US REP AGREED WITH SHAPE REP THAT MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE SHOULD NOT LIMIT PRIORITY TO FORCES AVAILABLE IN THE FIRST FEW DAYS OF A CONFLICT. HE POINTED OUT THAT CONCLUSIONS REGARDING USE OF WARNING WOULD AFFECT CONCLUSIONS ON PRIORITIES. HE REMINDED DRC THAT GOAL WAS TO DEVELOP ALTERNATE POSITIONS ON KEY ELEMENTS FOR MINISTERIAL DISCUSSION, NOT TO PAPER OVER DIFFERENCES.

5. HUMPHREYS RETURNED TO HIS ORIGINAL STATEMENT THAT RESOLUTION OF PRIORITIES ISSUE FOR MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE PRESUPPOSES DISCUSSION OF OTHER ISSUES. HE AGREED THAT DIFFERING VIEWS ON THOSE ISSUES WOULD RESULT IN DIFFERING GUIDANCE ON PRIORITIES, AND POINTED OUT THAT US MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE PAPER DISCUSSES AS WELL AS DIRECTS EMPHASIS ON CERTAIN CAPABILITIES. SHAPE REP SUGGESTED DRC ADDRESS PRIORITIES SUCH AS MUTUAL COOPERATION AND SUPPORT UNDER SOME MORE GENERAL RUBRIC IN THE FINAL GUIDANCE. HUMPHREYS AGREED, STATING THAT IS WILL CONSIDER THE US-SUGGESTED GENERAL ELEMENT COVERING "INCREASED EFFECIENCY THROUGH COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS." HE DECLARED THAT HE DOES NOT INTEND TO REDRAFT IS LANGUAGE ON PRIORITIES AT THIS TIME, AND DRC WILL RETURN TO PRIORITIES KEY ELEMENT FOLLOWING DISCUSSION OF ALL OTHERS.

6. NEXT MEETING. DRC TO DISCUSS CHARACTERISTICS OF FORCES AND CONTINUE RESOURCES DISCUSSION AT MEETING OCTOBER 30.  
MCAULIFFE.

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptoning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 11 JUN 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 29 OCT 1974  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** garlanwa  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1974ATO06018  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19741091/abbryds.tel  
**Line Count:** 136  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** A. USNATO 5714 B. USNATO 4527 C. USNATO 5938  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** garlanwa  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 10 APR 2002  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <10 APR 2002 by kelleyw0>; APPROVED <24-Oct-2002 by garlanwa>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** DRC MEETING OCTOBER 28; KEY ELEMENTS OF MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE - PRIORITIES  
**TAGS:** MPOL, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO ALL NATO CAPTIALS  
USCINCEUR  
USNMR SHAPE  
USLOSACLANT  
CINCLANT  
CINCUSNAVEUR

CINCUSAFE

Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005